

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8                   AT SEATTLE

9 JENNIFER ASPREY KEANE and  
10 CHRISTOPHER KEANE, wife and husband,

11                   Plaintiff/Counter-Defendants,

12                   v.

13 40 YEARS, INC. (d/b/a 40 Years of Zen), a  
14 Delaware Corporation, and DAVID ASPREY,

15                   Defendants/Counter-Plaintiffs/Third-  
16                   Party Plaintiffs,

17                   v.

18 ZOOMIUS, INC., a Nevada Corporation, and  
19 TRACK INTELLIGENCE, INC., a Nevada  
20 corporation,

21                   Third-Party Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-1768 RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR STATUS CONFERENCE

21                   Plaintiffs have requested that the Court schedule a status conference to address “the  
22 undesirable trajectory of the attorneys’ working relationship in this case” and to “explore an  
23 appropriate judicial resource and/or process (magistrate judge or special master) to address  
24 attorney professionalism, should the need arise in the future.” Dkt. #48. Defendants choose to  
25 file 249 pages in response to provide the Court “all necessary context” to consider the attorneys’  
26 professionalism and to air their own grievances. Dkts. #50 and #51. Defendants argue that the

1 Court should “reject the [Plaintiffs’] Motion for a Status Conference for a failure to comply with  
2 the Local Rules,” but should, nevertheless, hold a status conference to discuss Plaintiffs’ conduct  
3 and other case developments. Dkt. #50. The Court declines to play audience to the numerous  
4 arguments and disputes that appear to plague this litigation.

5 Plaintiffs are correct that the Court places a high emphasis on the professionalism of the  
6 counsel appearing before it. The Court’s Local Civil Rules specifically provides:  
7

8 Along with the cost of civil litigation, the judges of this district are very concerned  
9 about professionalism among attorneys, especially in the conduct of discovery. The  
10 judges of this district expect a high degree of professionalism from the lawyers  
11 practicing before them. The orders issued by judges of this district at the outset of a  
12 case to govern conduct and scheduling of written discovery and depositions express  
13 those expectations. There should be no difference between the professional conduct  
14 of counsel when appearing before the court and when engaged outside it whether in  
15 discovery or any other phase of a case.  
16

Local Civil Rules, Intro. Further, local counsel is specifically to “remind *pro hac vice* counsel  
of the court’s commitment to maintaining a high degree of professionalism and civility from the  
lawyers practicing before this court as set forth in the Introduction to the Civil Rules.” LCR  
83.1(d)(2).

The Court expects all counsel to act professionally, but that responsibility lies primarily  
with counsel. The Court addresses sanctionable conduct to protect the integrity of the courts.<sup>1</sup>  
The Court should not have to referee uncivil interactions, especially in cases where the disputes  
are frequent and unrestrained. The Court will not volunteer to be drawn into the fray. The Court  
cannot imagine that these slights and retorts are a constructive use of the parties’ money (or  
counsel’s time and efforts). But commandeering the Court’s time to address counsels’ inability  
to interact civilly and professionally is a flippant use of scarce judicial resources.

---

25  
26<sup>1</sup> This is not an invitation to bring disputes before the Court as motions for sanctions.

1           The unnecessarily contentious nature of the litigation is evident. But beyond an equally  
2 pointed admonishment, it is unclear what a status conference would accomplish at this point. The  
3 parties, not the Court, must determine how all involved can maintain a professional working  
4 relationship and resolve this dispute for their clients. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion for Status  
5 Conference (Dkt. #48) is DENIED.

6           Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of February 2019.  
7

8             
9

10           RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
11           CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26